

TATSAMA GY

by *A. C. Woolner*

(1) There are a few words in Hindi written with **jñ** but regularly pronounced with **gy**: for example **gyān** 'knowledge' and derivatives from the same root such as **gyānī**, **gyāpak**, **āgyā**; **yagya** 'sacrifice' etc.

Similar forms are found in Panjabi and Bengali **Pb. giān** 'knowledge', **giānī** or **gayānī** 'learned', **āgiā** 'command'. For Bengali see S. K. Chatterji, *The Origin and Development of the Bengali Language*, p. 462. He records **gy**, **-ggy** and **gey-**.

Pb. jagg, **B. O. jāg**, **Sindhi jagu** (quoted by Beames I. 302.) evidently come from a similar treatment of **yajña**.

The substitution of a vowel for **y** and the nasalisation of **y** may be ignored for the moment. It seems clear that these forms are based upon the pronunciation of Sanskrit **jñ** as **gy**, which is common to pandits in the North and East of India.

The **tadbhava** treatment of **jñ** is indicated by **H. nātā** 'kinship' (**jñātītva**) **Pb. nāttā. janeu (yajñopavīta)**. **Ph. janeū**.

Rāṇī 'queen' may have been associated with **rāṇā** from **rājānaka**, but cf. **Romani rānī**.

(2) In Gujrat there is a pronunciation **gn** as in **gnān** 'knowledge' (Clair Tisdall records a *svarabhakti* variety of this; **ganān**.) **Tadbhava** forms are **janoi (yajñopavīta)** and **jān** 'knowledge. In the Marathi country there is the pronunciation of **jñ** as **dny**, as in the name **Dnyānoba**, while **tadbhava** treatment is seen in **nātē** 'kinship' (J. Bloch, *Langue marathee*, p. 357.) **jānavē (yajñopavīta)** and perhaps in **rāṇī** 'queen'.

(There is also **j** in **paij** from **pratijnā**. J. Bloch, p. 139. Cf. Old H. **jaj** for **yajña**.)

(3) These varieties **gy**, **gn** and **dny** do not seem to be **Prakritic**. Pischel, *Grammatik der Prakrit Sprachen*, §276. gives the following treatments of **jñ**.

- (i) Regularly **jñ** becomes **ññ** (or **ñ**) e. g. **āñā** from **ājñā**,
- (ii) It becomes **nn** (**n**). AMg. **nāṇa** 'knowledge'. cf. H. **nātā**. **janeu**, M. **nātē**, **jānavē**.
- (iii) In Māgadhi and Pāṣāṇī **jñ** becomes **ññ** (**ñ**). according to Hemacandra. **yañña** from **yajña**.
- (iv) According to Hemacandra **jñ** also becomes **jj** in some words: **ajjā** from **ājñā**, **jāṇa** from **jñāna**.
cf. Mar. **paij** from **pratiñā**. Old H. **jaj** from **yajña**.

There was also the **svarabhakti** method: Pāli **rājinī**.
Old H. **rājinī**.

Three of these survive in Marathi and J. Bloch remarks (p. 139.) "ni dans l'histoire ancienne ni dans la répartition des dialectes modernes on ne trouve d'indication permettant de rendre compte de cette diversité."

It is clear that once the process of prakritic assimilation is complete as in the four treatments given above, there can be no phonetic reason for going on to **gy**, **gn** or **dyn**.

In other words this variation in the pronunciation of Sanskrit is not due to the influence of the Prakrits or of modern Indian languages. Whence then can it come?

(4) If we are to form any idea as to how the diversity arose, we must determine a more ancient pronunciation of **jñ**.

If we assume this to have been **j+ñ** i. e. something like **ḍj+ñ**, we may be satisfied about the origin of **dyn**.

If again **ḍj** is not a true palatal but comes forward nearer to an alveolar or dental **ḍ** or **dz**, then (**ḍj**)n or (**dz**)n would become by assimilation **nn** (**n**).

The survival of **j** in **paij** and **jaj** would show the other method of assimilation.

But we are no nearer to **gy** and **gn**.

(5) Now Sanskrit **j** is ultimately derived from a palatal stop **ḷ** or we may conveniently write **g'**.

S. K. Chatterji¹ tells us that the affricate pronunciation of the palatal stops seems to have been only dialectal in the Early M. I. A. period and that for some time the stop value and affricate value went on, side by side.

The present writer had long suspected that Old Indo-Aryan possessed true palatal stops not affricates.

Macdonell however thought the affricate pronunciation indicated by the Greek reproductions of Indian names made it likely that they were so pronounced in Vedic times. (Vedic Grammar, § 35. cf. Wackernagel, I. 119.) It is true that an affricate pronunciation of *j* in Iranian is required to account for the variation *z* in Avestan and *d* in Persian corresponding to Sanskrit *j*. (Cf. also Old Persian *xšnāsātiy* 'Let him recognise' and *adānā* 'he knew'. Meillet, Grammaire du Vieux Perse, pp. 60 and 99.)

But in either case to whatever date the palatal stop *g'* survived in pandits' speech it is quite possible that it survived still longer in the complex *g'ñ*.

(6) Supposing we start with *g'ñ*, this might change in two or three different ways.

- (i) where and when the palatal *ñ* was no longer correctly pronounced *g'ñ* could be replaced by *gn*.
- (ii) Before that the assimilation of the nasal to the stop but leaving an offglide *y* would result in *gy*. Cf. the assimilation of *gn* to *gg*.
- (iii) When *g'* had been replaced by palatal *d'* and then made affricate *dz* or *dz*, the complex *g'ñ* could become *d'ñ* and then *dny*.

Or we may state the matter thus:—

Pandit speech.

g'ñ - *g'n* - (*g*)*gy*-*gy*.

gn.

d'ñ - *dny*.

Prakrit.

d'n - ññ

ṇṇ

Later (ḍ) n } j or n.
(ḍz) n }

If that is so, the variation **gy, gn, dny** goes back to a variation in pandits' speech caused by replacing **g'** by **d'**, to which standing by itself a sibilant was added instead of an off-glide resembling **y**.

(7) It may be asked whether there are any other instances where variations in the pronunciation of Sanskrit seem to be independent of ordinary prakritic changes.

One such instance may be the rendering of the cerebral **ṣ** by **kh**. Some pandits say **upanikhad** for **upanīṣad**. (Cf. the form *Oupnekbhat* of Anquetil Duperron from a Persian transcription) Hindi and Panjabi represent Sanskrit cerebral **ṣ** as **kh**-**bhākhā** for **bhāṣā**. On this see S. K. Chatterji, *Bengali Language*, p. 243. where he says "in certain forms of OIA. the [X] sound was actually the one employed for [ṣ], as we can infer from a mediaeval pronunciation of [ṣ] as [kh] which still obtains, -[kh] being the nearest Middle Indian approximation to a traditional [X]". He then mentions Slavonic **snŭxa**, **synŭxŭ** = Skt. **śnuṣā**, **śūnuṣu** and the wellknown variation Pashto and Pakhto.

(8) If **ṣ** is a sibilant variant of **x** which survived dialectically in OIA. of Northern India and is still represented by Middle Indian and modern **kh**, we might expect to see the effect of this variation in the complex **kṣ**.

In an **x**-dialect this would be **kx**. Such may be the source of the tatsama pronunciation **khy** and the prakritic **kkh**.

In a sibilant dialect it would be **kṣ**, now the orthodox Sanskrit pronunciation. In this complex Prakrit has replaced **k** with a **t** sound.

kṣ.tṣ-tṣʼ-ttṣʼ i.e. **cch**.

Efforts to account for the variation **kṣ** becomes **kkh** or **cch** on the basis of a distinction in Indo-Iranian have not been successful. (See Pischel, *Prakrit Grammar*, §§318-321. Geiger, *Pali Grammar*, §56. J. Bloch, *Langue marathe*, §104.)

According to the view suggested above the variation depends on more or less of sibilation in OIA. and is parallel to the variation of **kh** and **ṣ** and at a little distance to that of **gy** and **dny**.

All three non-sibilant pronunciations are found in Northern India, though **gy** has extended into Bengal, and in the Prakrits forms with **kkh** and **cch** are considerably intermingled.

(9) It has to be realised however that these are not so much variations in local speech as variations in the habits of learned speech, which is much more conservative on one hand, while it has on the other hand a tendency to make a conscious effort to avoid vernacular errors, especially in periods when Sanskrit schools are flourishing. Consequently the exact form of a **semi-tatsama** will depend not merely on local phonetics, but also on the pandits and the degree of their influence at a particular period. This is illustrated by some of the modern forms of proper names *e.g.* **Krishan**, **Kishan** **Kisan** as opposed to **Kistna** and **tadbhava** **Kaṇha**.

From this point of view it would be of interest to reconstruct as far as possible the history of the pronunciation of Sanskrit in different parts of India.